

Meeting Minutes

Monthly Status Reporting Revision Working Team

DAY: 12/12/06
TIME: 1:00pm – 2:00pm
LOCATION: 3900 Conference Room 39A

Meeting Called By:	Gaye Mays		
Meeting Purpose:	Resource Tracking/PPM Tool		
Attendees: Unable to attend: David Butts, Greg Jones, Barbara Swartz, Richard McGee	Gaye Mays – EPMO Steve Tedder - EPMO David Butts - Wildlife Resources Commission	Bob Giannuzzi - EPMO Barbara Swartz – Strategic Initiatives Richard McGee – EPMO/QA	Greg Jones – Crime Control Lucy Cornelius – DHHS Manny Zech – DOT Jim Tulenko- Strategic Initiatives
Meeting Documents:			
Attachments:			
Next Meeting:	1/09/07 @ 1pm		

Discussion Points

1	Agenda topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPM Tool Resource Tracking demo & discussion: Jim Tulenko gave a demo of how resources could be tracked at a high level using the current PPM tool. Entry and tracking of hours used could be entered in the same manner as budget costs are entered today. The tool would automatically calculate the actual and forecasted project hours by phase as well as the variance. The team agreed that we should solicit a number of project managers who would be willing to test this feature and provide feedback. Jim will ask for volunteers at the next Project Manager Advisory Group meeting on 12/18. • Validate recommendations identified to date: The team completed a quick review of the short term recommendations; additional discussion needs to take place before recommendations are final.
2	“Top 10” problems/issues identified with current process: (<i>Long term vs. short term solution noted</i>) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Difficulties with using the PPM tool/overall inflexibility - <i>Long term</i> 2. Tool should measure triple constraints (scope, cost, schedule) but currently does not measure these accurately – <i>Long term</i> 3. Project schedule measurement is “time consumption” rather than an “earned value” type metric – <i>Long term</i> 4. Under utilization of resources is viewed as a negative – <i>Short term (perception issue)</i> 5. Need to more clearly define milestones to make them more meaningful – <i>Short term</i> 6. PPM tool does not accommodate the conceptual phase of a project, thus when the project meets the criteria to be input into the tool, the level of detail required may be difficult to capture and the PM must complete a number of “catch up” status reports – <i>possible short term</i> 7. PPM tool does not accommodate other development methodologies such as “Agile” – <i>Being addressed by gate review team</i> 8. Cannot see appropriate detail in current tool status report i.e. detail on issues and risks – <i>Long term</i> 9. Limited capacity for comments and ability to reference historical information – <i>Long term</i> 10. Resource management is not integrated into UMT tool. Difficult to accurately reconcile time for all resources. – <i>May have partial short term solution with current PPM tool</i>

3	Recommendations (short term): Keep current monthly status reporting process in place with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage agencies that produce manual status reports to attach in the tool as additional information regarding their project • Work with Jim Tulenko to determine if changes can be made to the current status reporting format to develop a new report that agencies can use internally for their senior management updates • Flag projects that are under budget overall by 10% as yellow and over by 15% as red • EPMO should provide training/examples on clearly defined milestones • Define a consistent process for addressing item #6 above – current recommendations is to ask agencies to complete a manual status report during initiation phase and/or allow agencies to change start date and show all cost to date in the first month's status report.
4	Project Approach & Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define audience for monthly status reports –<i>representative agencies have defined the audience status reports are prepared for in their agency; the PPM tool status report is primarily used by the EPMO QA group</i> • Define elements that should be included in status reports – <i>current elements plus an earned value calculation</i> • Define/evaluate status codes (red, green, yellow, etc.) and alerts – <i>in progress</i> • Collect example reports already in use – <i>in progress</i> • Formulate recommendations – identify “quick wins” and long term requirements

Action Item Updates

1	Validate audience for EPMO monthly status reports – Gaye will discuss with Sharon Hayes – <i>11/15 Sharon advised that the current monthly status reporting process is designed to provide project information to facilitate the QA process.</i>
2	Draft suggested changes to “jelly bean” parameters – Steve Tedder & Lucy Cornelius – <i>11/28 Lucy completed DHHS feedback</i>
3	Evaluate PPM resource tracking functionality – <i>next step is to have project managers test this capability</i>